

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 2, 2003. Claims 32-39 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended Claims 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 37, and 38 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to amended claims.

The Examiner has indicated that there is no disclosure in the original specification for the term "substantially all the pixels" as set forth in Claim 32. Applicants disagree with this, since the specification sets forth on page 62, lines 17-19 that "each pixel will have a value that ranges from zero to 255 and these are summed up for the *entire* page." (Emphasis added) Applicants believe that this line clearly supports that the toner value for substantially all the pixels is accumulated. Therefore, Applicants believe that the statement "substantially all the pixels" in the Specification is correct and fully supported by the Specification.

The Examiner has also objected to the language associated with the paragraph "decrementing ....." in Claim 32. Claim 32 has been amended to more clearly point out the fact that the current toner value is decremented and maintained if the decremented value is greater than the minimum toner level value. The amended language is believed to clear up any problems. Further, the claim has been amended to indicate that the rasterized image is sent to the print engine at the associated printing location only if the toner level value associated therewith, after decrementing thereof, is determined to be greater than the minimum toner level.

In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**  
S/N 09/848,456  
Atty. Dkt. No. TRSY-25,474

the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection with respect to the amended claims.

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sakuma*, U. S. Patent No. 5,663,750 in view of *Fukui et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,124,751. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended Claims.

As set forth in the prior response, the deficiency in *Sakuma* is that *Sakuma* does not "inhibit" transfer of the print job to a print engine; rather, all that *Sakuma* does is to reduce the amount of ink that will be consumed during a print job. In one embodiment, if insufficient ink is present, a printing operation is stopped. However, the image is already sent to the print engine and, as set forth in last Response, there can never be re-routing of the rasterized image. The *Fukui et al.* reference does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection with respect to the amended claims. ) ??

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/TRSY-25,474 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P. ) NO

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/yoc

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE  
S/N 09/848,456  
Atty. Dkt. No. TRSY-25,474

SENT BY: HOWISON, & ARNO;

972 479 0464

; MAR-2-04 11:31PM;

PAGE 9/9

7

Tel: 972-479-0462

Fax: 972-479-0464

March 2, 2004

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**  
S/N 09/848,456  
Atty. Dkt. No. TRSY-25,474